

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER LUC-432 / Halsell 12  
13  
NOV 06 2006

### Remarks

Entry of the above-noted amendments, reconsideration of the application, and allowance of all claims pending are respectfully requested. By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 13, 15, 20, and 22 are amended and claims 9 and 17 are canceled. These amendments to the claims constitute a bona fide attempt by applicant to advance prosecution of the application and obtain allowance of certain claims, and are in no way meant to acquiesce to the substance of the rejections. All claim language was previously recited (e.g., original claims 9 and 17) and thus, no new matter has been added. Claims 1-8, 10-16, and 18-22 are pending.

### Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action mailed January 24, 2006 indicated that claims 9 and 17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Office Action stated (page 2, lines 8-11):

However, consider Connolly or combination are fail to suggest or fairly teach wherein the second control component consolidates the billing record of the toll-free call with the one or more billing records associated with the standard telephone number for an owner of the mobile phone.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 12 to include the limitations of claims 9 and 17 that were cited by the Final Office Action as constituting allowable subject matter. Claim 20 has also been amended.

An indication of allowance of claims 1-8, 10-16, and 18-22 is therefore respectfully requested.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Spradlin (U.S. Patent No. 5,946,623). Claims 12 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Connolly (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,504). Claims 2-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Spradlin in view of Bolduc et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,681,008; "Bolduc"). Claims 4-8, 10-11, 14-16, 18-19, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Spradlin in view of Bolduc and further in view of Connolly. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Connolly in view of Bolduc. These rejections are respectfully, but most strenuously, traversed.

For explanatory purposes, applicant discusses herein one or more differences between the claimed invention and the Office Action's citations to Spradlin and Connolly. This discussion, however, is in no way meant to acquiesce in any characterization that one or more parts of the Office Action's citations to Spradlin or Connolly correspond to the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action's citations to the applied references, with or without modification or combination, assuming, *arguendo*, that the modification or combination of the Office Action's citations to the applied references is proper, do not teach or suggest the second control component that adds the billing record for the toll-free call to the one or more billing records associated with the standard telephone number and consolidates the billing record of the toll-free call with the one or more billing records associated with the standard telephone number for the owner of the mobile phone, as recited in applicant's independent claim 1.

Spradlin (column 9, lines 1-8) discloses:

In another alternative embodiment, for example, the signal transmitted by WTU 10 corresponds to an 800 or other toll-free number associated with home service location 40, and mobile telephone switching office 24 queries a database in order to translate that toll-free number to a regular telephone number corresponding to home service location 40, to which it routes the call from WTU 10 for service.

Spradlin discloses the toll-free call routed from the WTU for service. Spradlin fails to disclose consolidating a billing for a toll-free call terminated to the WTU and a billing for a regular telephone number for the WTU. This point is conceded in the Office Action dated January 24, 2006, page 2, paragraphs 1-3.

Accordingly, the Office Action's citation to Spradlin fails to satisfy at least one of the limitations recited in applicant's independent claim 1.

Connolly (column 3, lines 45 to column 4, line 3) discloses:

In FIG. 1, a typical sequence of a toll free call is as follows:

1. The caller dials a UIFN eight digit number, NNNN NNNN prefixed by an + and 800 as explained above.
2. The call is routed via a local exchange (PSTN) to an international gateway 10 which sends the UIFN number to a switch/data storage control unit 11.
3. The unit 11 identifies the destination and routes the number through a selected x.25 packet or Intranet TCP/IP network (PSPDN), to a like control unit 12, providing the separate communication channel for supporting the toll free service.
4. The unit 12 translates the UIFN number to a PSTN number and determines the routing for communication back to the caller on the PSTN network. The unit sends a "MEET ME" call via an international gateway 13 and PSTN to the international gateway 10.
5. The gateway 13 relays the "MEET ME" call to the control unit 11.

6. The unit 12 also initiates a local call for the TNO to connect to the UIFN customer via a local PSTN.

7. When the UIFN customer answers, the control unit 12 monitors the call details, and creates records for settlement and the customer's bill.

Connolly discloses connecting the UIFN customer via the local PSTN. Connolly fails to disclose connecting the call to a mobile phone. Connolly fails to disclose consolidating a billing record for the toll-free call with a billing record associated with a standard telephone number for a mobile phone. This point is conceded in the Office Action dated January 24, 2006, page 2, paragraphs 1-3.

Accordingly, the Office Action's citation to Connolly fails to satisfy at least one of the limitations recited in applicant's independent claim 1.

Bolduc (Abstract) discloses:

An automated toll-free telecommunications information service may be provided responsive to a user sending an E-Mail request via the Internet or by a caller dialing a toll-free telephone number and announcing a voice request. A service node interprets the request and collects matches to the request from a database. A match to a request may comprise the identity of an entity corresponding to the match, a toll-free number for the match and a brief information sketch describing the entity. The matches are announced and played for the caller. The caller may barge in with a predetermined voice announcement such as "please dial" when they wish to select an item of the list. In response, the service node initiates the launch of a call to the selected entity.

Bolduc discloses the automated toll-free telecommunications information service. Bolduc fails to disclose consolidating a billing record for the toll-free call with a billing record associated with a standard telephone number for a mobile phone. This point is conceded in the Office Action dated January 24, 2006, page 2, paragraphs 1-3.

Accordingly, the Office Action's citation to Bolduc fails to satisfy at least one of the limitations recited in applicant's independent claim 1.

17

LUC-432 / Halsell 12

The Office Action's citations to Spradlin, Connolly, and Bolduc all fail to meet at least one of applicant's claimed features. For example, there is no teaching or suggestion in the Office Action's citations to Spradlin, Connolly, or Bolduc of the second control component that adds the billing record for the toll-free call to the one or more billing records associated with the standard telephone number and consolidates the billing record of the toll-free call with the one or more billing records associated with the standard telephone number for the owner of the mobile phone, as recited in applicant's independent claim 1.

For all the reasons presented above with reference to claim 1, claims 1, 12, and 20 are believed neither anticipated nor obvious over the art of record. The corresponding dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons as independent claims 1, 12, and 20, as well as for their own additional characterizations.

Withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmen B. Patti  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: November 6, 2006

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
Customer Number 47382